REMARKS

Claims 1 – 6, 10 – 14, and 16 – 18 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

Applicant notes that on the Form HDP-1449 sent with the Office Action, the Examiner did not initial the references cited under the U.S. Patent Documents section of the Form HDP-1449. Specifically, U.S. Pat. Nos. 5,717,475A to Kamio et al; 6,052,169 to Kim; and 6,456,279 to Kubo et al, as well as U.S. Pat. Pub. 2001/0033264 A1 to Ishii, were not initialed as having been considered by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully requests clarification with respect to whether these references were considered by the Examiner in the next Office communication.

DOUBLE PATENTING

1. Claims 1, 4-10, and 17-18 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 of Hagiwara (U.S. Patent No. 6,665,037) in view of Tajima (U.S. Pat. No. 6,133,978 A). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant elects to file a terminal disclaimer, included herewith, disclaiming the terminal part of the statutory term of any patent granted on the instant application, which would extend beyond the expiration date of the full statutory term defined in 35 U.S.C. 154 and 173 of prior Patent No. 6,665,037, which is commonly owned by Seiko Epson Corporation. As such, the double patenting rejection should now be rendered moot.

2. Claim 2 stands rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 14 of Hagiwara (U.S. Patent No. 6,665,037) in view of Tajima (U.S. Pat. No. 6,133,978 A). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As stated above, Applicant elects to file a terminal disclaimer, included herewith, disclaiming the terminal part of the statutory term of any patent granted on the instant application, which would extend beyond the expiration date of the full statutory term defined in 35 U.S.C. 154 and 173 of prior Patent No. 6,665,037, which is commonly owned by Seiko Epson Corporation. As such, the double patenting rejection should now be rendered moot.

3. Claim 3 stands rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 14 of Hagiwara (U.S. Patent No. 6,665,037) in view of Tajima (U.S. Pat. No. 6,133,978 A). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As stated above, Applicant elects to file a terminal disclaimer, included herewith, disclaiming the terminal part of the statutory term of any patent granted on the instant application, which would extend beyond the expiration date of the full statutory term defined in 35 U.S.C. 154 and 173 of prior Patent No. 6,665,037, which is commonly owned by Seiko Epson Corporation. As such, the double patenting rejection should now be rendered moot.

4. Claims 4 and 11-12 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 16-18 of Hagiwara (U.S. Patent No. 6,665,037) in view of Tajima (U.S. Pat. No. 6,133,978 A). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As stated above, Applicant elects to file a terminal disclaimer, included herewith, disclaiming the terminal part of the statutory term of any patent granted on the instant application, which would extend beyond the expiration date of the full statutory term defined in 35 U.S.C. 154 and 173 of prior Patent No. 6,665,037, which is commonly owned by Seiko Epson Corporation. As such, the double patenting rejection should now be rendered moot.

5. Claims 1 and 13-16 stands rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 of Hagiwara (U.S. Patent No. 6,665,037) in view of Tajima (U.S. Pat. No. 6,133,978 A). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As stated above, Applicant elects to file a terminal disclaimer, included herewith, disclaiming the terminal part of the statutory term of any patent granted on the instant application, which would extend beyond the expiration date of the full statutory term defined in 35 U.S.C. 154 and 173 of prior Patent No. 6,665,037, which is commonly owned by Seiko Epson Corporation. As such, the double patenting rejection should now be rendered moot.

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

6. Claim 1 has been amended to call first electrodes that include a first drive portion for applying an electric field to the electro-optic layer, a wiring portion connected to the first drive portion, and an inter-substrate conducting terminal portion connected to the wiring portion, and electrically connected to said first terminals through conductive particles included in said sealing material. The second electrode includes a second drive portion for applying an electric field to said electro-optic layer, and a second terminal connected to the second drive portion. Claim 1 has also been amended to call for the first and second terminals to be arranged to lie side by side along one side of the second substrate, and connected respectively to the corresponding driving ICs. The first terminals are located closer to the center than the second terminal, and the first terminals extend radially from the corresponding driving IC toward the inter-substrate conducting terminal portion. Lastly, claim 1 has been amended to call for the wiring portion of the first electrodes to extend radially from the inter-substrate conducting terminal portion toward the first drive portion, and the second drive portion, the second terminal of the second electrode, and the first terminals to be made of a metallic film that has a lower electrical resistance than that of the first electrodes.

Claims 2, 3, and 4 have been amended in a similar manner. The subject matter of amended claims 1, 2, 3, and 4 can be found throughout the specification and drawings as filed. No new matter has been added.

The claimed invention has a featured structure such that after the group of the first terminals is radially extended, by electrically connecting between the upper and the lower substrates through conductive particles in the sealing material, the group of the

first terminals are further radially extended. Due to this structure, the claimed invention achieves remarkable effects. For example, since the group of the first terminals, which is made by the metal layers with low electrical resistance and with high flexibility of the layout, is radially extended, the space of the layout for the group of the first terminals is narrower than in a case that the group of the first terminals is linearly arranged. Furthermore, since the group of the first terminals are radially extended by using a margin that is required to exist between the sealing material and the first drive portion, the electrodes can be arranged in a compact design.

None of the cited prior art references anticipate or render obvious such a structure. Since none of the cited references anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully asserts that the claimed invention is in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 9, 2004

By: _____
G. Gregory Schivley, Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade, Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGS/BEW/JAH